

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

FEB 16 2018

Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy
Courts for the District of Columbia

ELLIS S. BELFER,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ANDREA I. MARSHALL, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 18-0108 (UNA)


MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter comes before the Court upon review of plaintiff's application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and *pro se* complaint. The allegations of the complaint pertain to proceedings in a New Jersey family court. It appears that the plaintiff's spouse initiated legal proceedings regarding child custody and support. Among other relief, the plaintiff asks that this federal district court void the judgment of the New Jersey court.

In *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971), the Supreme Court held that, "except in extraordinary circumstances, a federal court should not enjoin a pending state proceeding (including an administrative proceeding) that is judicial in nature and involves important state interests." *Id.* at 41; see *Huffman v. Pursue, Ltd.*, 420 U.S. 592, 604 (1975) (noting that *Younger* "also rests upon the traditional reluctance of courts of equity . . . to interfere with a criminal prosecution"). Resting on both on equitable principles and on concerns for comity and federalism, see *Ohio Civil Rights Comm'n v. Dayton Christian Sch., Inc.*, 477 U.S. 619, 627-28 (1986), *Younger* precludes federal adjudication when three criteria are met: (1) there are ongoing state proceedings that are judicial in nature; (2) the state proceedings implicate important state

interests; and (3) the proceedings afford an adequate opportunity to raise the federal claims, *see Bridges v. Kelly*, 84 F.3d 470, 476 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (citations omitted). Extraordinary circumstances, such as “bad faith, harassment, or a patently invalid state statute,” *Sprint Comm’ns, Inc. v. Jacobs*, 134 S. Ct. 584, 591 (2013), which might warrant this Court’s involvement are not apparent in this case.

Accordingly, the complaint will be dismissed. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is issued separately.


United States District Judge

DATE: 2/15, 2018